



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/606,445	06/29/2000	Narendra Pulimi	CS10744	8066
75	590 08/19/2003			
Motorola Inc Personal Communications Sector Intellectual Property Department (PJB)			EXAMINER	
			GELIN, JEAN ALLAND	
Libertyville, IL	Highway 45 Rm AN475 60048		ART UNIT	
•			2681	
			DATE MAILED: 08/19/2003	/\

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	00				
Advisory Action	09/606,445	PULIMI ET AL.	$\langle \chi \rangle$				
,	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jean A Gelin	2681					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) \square The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly				
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>12-16</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,7,10 and 11</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6 and 8</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>							

· ;

The Applicant argues that Tray fails to disclose a first element or a second element of a multi band antenna. However, the preceding limitation is read on Tray wherein Tray teaches an inner element (first element) and outer element (second element) on the same axis (fig. 1, and col. 2, lines 51-55). The Applicant further argues that the grounded helical antenna cannot be said to surround the multiband antenna, if the grounded helical antenna is also part of the multi-band antenna as suggested by the Examiner, and feed portion 34 in combination with helix 11 is not equivalent to a multi-band antenna including a first and a second elements having different resonant frequencies, which is then surrounded by grounded helical coil. However, the Examiner believes that Tray (615) still meet the claim limitation as follow: fig. 1 is broadband antenna (i.e., multi-band antenna), first and second helixes (element) having different frequencies is read on col. 4, lines 12-23 wherein the helixes have different resonant frequency, and a grounded helical antenna surrounding the multiband is also read on Tray, col. 2, lines 51-55, and col. 3, lines 39-52, wherein the outer helix 12 is wound around the inner helix and feed portion 34, which is also part of the antenna. Therefore, the rejection remains.

I.G (703) 305-4847